

SECRET
(WHEN FILLED IN)

3P

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET /0121 22530 0121

INSTRUCTIONS: Use officer designations in the "TO" column. Number each comment to correspond with the number in the "TO" column. Draw a line across the sheet under each comment. Each officer should date and initial (check mark insufficient) before further routing. This Routing and Record sheet should NOT be removed from the attached RECORD document.

FROM:

DOCUMENT NUMBER

EGMA-22530.

DOCUMENT DATE

EE/REC

DOCUMENT MICROFILM SERVICE

TO

ROOM NO.

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS

1.

EE/H

17

1956

NOTE: If a copy or attachments are removed from the attached document, note the location of the copy and/or attachment hereon. If this RECORD COPY is to be retained in the files at the Desk, call the Central File Section for permanent loan.

2.

P.C

3.

PP

4.

EE/G/DA

5.

EE/G/CE

29 AUG 1956

6.

EE/H

6 MAY 1960

DESENSITIZED

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2006

INDEXED

RETURN THIS DOCUMENT TO RID FOR MICROFILMING BEFORE IT IS FILED. IF THIS DOCUMENT IS TO BE RESTRICTED, CHECK HERE RESTRICTED TO

RID/MI 1035 L

Unit Designation

10.

RECLASSIFIED

11.

RI/

12.

RI/

13.

RI/

14.

FILE TITLE

0

L KSKA, BELA

FILE NUMBER

ENCLOSURE

ABSTRACT

DATE PROCESSED

INDEX

16 Aug 66

VIA: _____
(SPECIFY AIR OR SEA POUCH)

DISPATCH NO. EGMA-22530

SECRET
KAPOK
CLASSIFICATION

TO : Chief, EE
Attn:
FROM : Chief of Base, Munich
SUBJECT: GENERAL— Operational/HIMWAY/CART

DATE: 6 August 1956

Info: COS/G

SPECIFIC— Dr. Bela LISZKA - Status Report

Reference: EGMA-21060, May 56

Headquarters Action Required:

1. None; for information and files.

Developments

2. Subject received a further letter from his wife dated 17 May, again urging Subject to meet her in Berlin. With our concurrence Subject again countered with an invitation that the wife make a side-trip to Munich. The next letter from the wife, dated 5 June, made no mention of Subject's visiting her in Berlin. This confirmed in Subject's mind that the whole thing was really an AVH gambit in the first instance and that the only purpose of his wife's going there was to lure Subject to the East. Subject also detected a sense of relief in this letter, and was momentarily of the opinion that the AVH had now given up in his case. However, this sense of security was somewhat shattered by two further letters dated 23 June and 4 July from his son and wife respectively, interspersed by a telephone call from both to Subject on 1 July. The gist of these letters was that: it was known that Subject was working for TPFEELING; his wife had lost her job on this account (sic); Subject was thus working against his homeland, the result of which could only be the loosening of a war against a "free" country, in which his wife, son and ~~ESTYGE~~ daughter-in-law were living; and thus Subject should come home. With our concurrence, Subject responded to these letters, in short, that there was no question of his returning to Hungary at this time. Subject hopes that this will mark the end of the presumed AVH directed attempts to redefect him.

3. As mentioned in EGMA-21433, para 4, the approach to Subject by Karoly ROSE is apparently common knowledge among the emigres. Subject became aware of this in the following manner: In the week of 14 to 18 May - Subject cannot remember the exact day - a (Dr) HIVESSY appeared at the Hungarian Kanzlei (located in Subject's apartment) and introduced himself as from ODOPAL. HIVESSY stated he had already identified himself to the other members of the Kanzlei and Subject did not press HIVESSY for further identification. HIVESSY told Subject ODOPAL would like to know whether any other TPFEELING personnel had been approached by the Red Agent who had approached Subject. Subject at first pretended ignorance of what HIVESSY was referring to, but HIVESSY cut him off with the statement that the story of Subject's being visited in December was all over the Hungarian emigre community. Subject then indicated he knew of no other persons who

RECLASSIFIED

RI/AN

RI/HIS

RI/Files

*MA 26/17
16 AUG 1956
Munich*

DESENSITIZED

**KAPOK
SECRET**

ECMA-22530

Page 2

had been approached. Subject later asked the other members of the Kanzlei, whether it was true that the story of the visit to him by a Red Agent had been spread about. He was told that this was the case, and that they had refrained from mentioning the fact to Subject heretofore solely out of tact. Subject insists that only the Joseph REICHARDTs and Janos STOMFAY-STITZ knew of the approach. He considers it probable that STOMFAY-STITZ is the culprit who has spread the story, although he does not exclude the possibility that STOMFAY-STITZ told only his wife who subsequently did the spreading.

Case Officer Comments

4. The fact that unbeknownst to Subject the story of the approach to him has subsequently circulated through the Hungarian emigration may well account for the failure of the AVH to follow up on their initial approach with a recruitment attempt, and to confine their further efforts to an attempt to persuade him to return to Hungary. In any event, further association with Subject has led us to the firm conclusion that he would not prove a suitable D/A. In brief, we do not believe him capable of maintaining in the course of personal meetings with the AVH the fiction that he is not an AIS double agent. Our course in the past few months has thus been to disentangle ourselves from Subject, although maintaining the appearance of being at all times willing to advise him on what steps to take vis a vis the continued efforts to redefect him. We intend to continue to see Subject as he professes the need, since this is not costing any great effort on our part. Our one present single objective is to monitor further developments on the chance that we may find an opportunity to induce the AVH to make a further personal meeting with Subject and we may thus be able to identify another AVH asset. We intend to report further on Subject's case only in the event of a significant new development.

5. We contacted [] and his deputy in re HIVESSY's questioning a TPFEELING employee on behalf of ODOPAL without clearing first with [] office. At our suggestion, [] queried ODOPAL, JBINDENT and GRBAND successively in an effort to induce some service to own up to employing HIVESSY, but met with completely negative results. Subsequent attempts to run-down HIVESSY's address - we suspect this is Matyas HIVESSY, ex Salzburg ODOPAL agent - have been likewise unsuccessful. If we ever succeed in pinpointing HIVESSY's location, we plan that [] deputy contact him and oblige him to identify his sponsoring service. If it turns out to be ODOPAL, as we strongly suspect, [] intends to confront them on the matter again with appropriate comment.

Approved: []

Distribution:

3 - EE
2 - COS/G
2 - MOB

SECRET

KAPOK